

naturalists will owe not a small debt of gratitude to Dr. Blasius and Dr. Baldamus.

November 1861.

X.—*An Ornithological Letter on Heligoland.*

By Prof. Dr. J. H. BLASIUS*.

To the Editor of 'Naumannia.'

Brunswick, September 1858.

You want me to give you an account of my summer excursions . . . very well! To begin with Heligoland. It is a long time since I have seen so interesting a collection for European ornithology as that belonging to Mr. H. Gaetke, a painter, and secretary of the government of Heligoland. The contributions of Naumann in the 'Rhea,' and of Gaetke in Cabanis' 'Journal,' were calculated not only to attract the attention of ornithologists towards this isolated and rocky island, but to raise the curiosity of the ornithological world to a high degree. Independently, however, of a previous somewhat animated dispute on the moulting and colouring of birds, the assertions of Gaetke, although founded on fact, had been not only seriously questioned, but doubted altogether. Von Homeyer, in Cabanis' 'Journal' (1857, p. 143), amongst other matters observes,—“When the collector has no interest in deception, there is no reason to distrust his motives; but this is not so with regard to birds continually imported, especially from Heligoland, and proclaimed as novelties or great curiosities for the European fauna. If serious consideration is expected in these cases, positive statements are requisite. The Heligolanders, owing to their frequent intercourse with foreigners, no longer possess their primitive purity of morals. They know very well that a bird killed on their island has, comparatively to one of the same species imported from abroad, a greater value; and here lies the temptation for enhancing ten- or twenty-fold the

* Translated from 'Naumannia' for 1858. We have long wished to give an English translation of this very interesting paper of Dr. Blasius, but have been hitherto prevented from want of space. As relating to the extraordinary features presented by the Avifauna of one of our own possessions, and as containing the first discrimination of a new European species of Warbler, it is of great importance.—ED.

price of a specimen by false reports. It would be, therefore, most interesting to science that the ornithology of Heligoland should remain no longer closed to ornithologists."

It must be admitted that von Homeyer knew very well the import of his assertions. In his obscure phraseology he does not, it is true, cite any name, but in the whole article he evidently refers to the statements and opinions of Gaetke. Moreover, it is well known that of late years Gaetke is the only person in the island who has occupied himself with the science of ornithology. There is, therefore, not the slightest doubt as to whom these hints and insinuations are covertly addressed.

Gaetke declares that he found in the month of February five *Larus minutus* moulting into their white plumage; he asks whether v. Homeyer, whose views are opposed to his, has seen these birds; and observes that specimens obtained through the trade cannot be relied upon. To this v. Homeyer answers by hints and suspicions as to the questionable morality of the Heligolandiers.

Thus stood ornithological matters in Heligoland in the past year. Many statements as to what had occurred in Heligoland had been made, much had been quasi-foretold by Gaetke. "You see," says Gaetke again in Cabanis' 'Journal' (1856, p. 378), "the materials of our European ornithology are endless." But, according to v. Homeyer's assertions, it seems that this new and rich mine is nothing more than a swindle based on trickery of trade. And truly, if the assertions of v. Homeyer could have been believed, the question of ornithology in Heligoland must have entered upon a crisis from which no escape would have been possible.

But on whom was reliance to be placed? Gaetke spoke evidently from experience, being on the spot; and from the manner in which he spoke, there was no ground for supposing intentional fraud. Wherever he was not quite certain as to the species he made short notes, evidently founded on minute observation, and never ventured to employ a specific name. Moreover, whatever may be the personal inclination of any person to think about another, as long as there is no positive evidence to show the contrary, he ought to be considered as an honest man in

private as well as in literary or in public life. V. Homeyer proclaims his distrust only in the vaguest and most unsatisfactory manner—merely as a supposition, as a possibility or probability, without taking the slightest trouble to cite one single incontestable fact founded on his own observation and knowledge. In reading his article one sees that he is not personally acquainted with Heligoland. He concludes: “It would be most interesting to science that the ornithology of Heligoland should remain no longer closed to ornithologists.” Hitherto then we have been in the dark! and therefore it must be difficult to pronounce *à priori* either in a positive or negative sense on the question.

But how is the ornithology of Heligoland to be disclosed to ornithologists? *How?* when the ornithological observers in Heligoland are declared open to suspicion and stigmatized as scientific swindlers! Are the peculiarities of the ornithology of Heligoland to be divined by ornithologists or known by intuition? or must Gaetke send his collection to every one who exhibits an interest in them? This may be possible; but I should consider myself as transgressing the limits of propriety in addressing such a request to a man who was quite a stranger to me. And, moreover, of what use would that be, if the collection itself were a mere swindle—if it were “*an importation from abroad,*” and not the product of the island at all? A spurious specimen can be sent just as easily as an authentic one. And when once public opinion is raised against one who is denounced as a swindler, the most detailed explanations and the most elaborate proofs will prove of no avail.

It seemed to me that the best means to obtain correct information would be for ornithologists to take the trouble to go over to Heligoland and inquire into the matter personally; and that is what I have myself done this summer. I went to Heligoland and addressed myself forthwith to Gaetke, declaring honestly and freely that I went there, not for his sake, neither for the sake of the island, but merely for the sake of his ornithological collection; and I am bound to state that I was met on his part with a willingness and frankness which left nothing to desire.

Gaetke is not a native of Heligoland, but a Prussian by birth.

He was led to the island by his art, and became a collector and observer of ornithology merely by chance. This chance offered itself to him in the shape of a Norwegian Gyrfalcon killed in Heligoland. In a country where only Sparrows and Loons breed, the appearance of a noble Falcon was quite a phenomenon. Gaetke was sorry to leave this beautiful bird to decay, and made an attempt to stuff it as well as he was able. It forms the still-preserved nucleus of his collection; to which in the progress of time, and little by little, all other specimens that seemed to him of some importance were added. Finally he conceived the idea of collecting examples of all the species killed on the island, and has now succeeded in obtaining in this narrow space more than 400 out of about 500 known European species. In his endeavours to attain this result he was assisted by many of the indigenous inhabitants, fishers and gunners, and especially by the brothers Aeuckens. Gaetke kept from the beginning a diary of all the rarer species. The time, the spot, and the circumstances accompanying the killing of each bird are carefully registered, together with his observations. Besides, the diary contains special measurements—a process which can be performed only with fresh-killed birds, with flesh and tissues still existing, by means of stretching them in a peculiar manner on paper. The colours of the several parts, which are commonly changed or lost by preparation, are fully detailed. Even the voice, the posture, and the movement of the living birds are not forgotten in his notices. Every one who is at all acquainted with practical ornithology must be convinced by a glance at these, that there cannot have been the slightest attempt at deception; every one will recognize in them the evidence of a conscientious and careful observer. He who looks over the contents and the progress of this diary, and compares the text of the later with that of the previous years, will cast aside all idea of dishonesty with contempt. For my part, I hope that not one of the observations recorded in this diary may be lost to European ornithology.

The collection itself corresponds perfectly with the text and contents of this diary. Each individual belonging to a rare species is, without exception, still preserved in the collection.

The manner of preparation leaves no doubt whatever that the specimens were taken from birds freshly killed, and not from dry skins imported from abroad. They were all stuffed and set up by Gaetke himself, who has thus proved himself not only a skilful artist, but also a conscientious naturalist and good observer. More perfect specimens with respect to the posture, the setting up and the arrangement of the plumage, than the greater part of the birds of his collection, I know nowhere. Stuffed birds as beautiful as his splendid specimen of the *Motacilla certhiola*, Pall., as fresh in plumage as his *Turdus varius*, Pall., as his numerous specimens of *Emberiza pusilla*, Pall., of *Actitis rufescens*, Vieill., and of his *Larus roseus* in winter plumage, I never met with.

Even the incidental narratives and assertions of the islanders with respect to birds of passage agree perfectly with Gaetke's diary and his collection. The natives have not the slightest knowledge of systematic or conventional names; they call the birds according to certain peculiarities of voice or habits, in addition to some known name. So, for instance, the *Anthus richardi*, Vieill., is called the "Brief," from its call; and the *Anthus campestris* is called the "Kleine Brief." Generally these denominations bear a character of *naïveté*, and they show at all events a fixed and quick perception and observation. Like the impassioned hunter who remembers every step, every movement of the stag or roebuck he has killed, and who will in after years tell you about his thoughts and feelings, and boast of his prowess in chase of the noble animal—how he stooped, glided and crept on the plain or the hill-side—in the same manner the island-gunners will recount the history of every bird they have killed and delivered for Gaetke's collection. When you are riding or walking with them along the island and direct the conversation to this subject, it will seem to you as though every winding of the rock were animated. "Here I found, amongst more than a hundred dead swallows, the beautiful red-headed one (*Hirundo rufula*, Temm.), which had been chased by Gaetke for two days at the peril of his life; here my brother killed the beautiful red cuneate-tailed Gull (*Larus roseus*, Jard. & Selby)." On one occasion, having taken my usual walk on the island

in company of one of the islanders, without Gaetke, I said to one of my friends—"Do you believe that these people tell us the truth, or are their narratives mere fables?" He answered, "How come you to have such an idea? If these are fables, then the whole island is but a fiction, and we are not here in the middle of the sea, but rather on the heath of Lunenburg." Yet there are people who consider the whole thing a fiction, and a barefaced attempt at imposition. But if the diary, wherein the time, the place, the measurement, the voice and the habits of the bird are registered, together with the name of the individual from whom each specimen has been obtained—if the concordance of the diary with the collection, the concurrence of the narratives of the islanders themselves with the assertions of Gaetke and his collection—if the detailed accounts (confirmed by subsequent testimony) of the chase of each separate and rare bird, and the collection itself, which shows that it could have been formed only from fresh-killed birds, and these set up by an artistic hand—if all this be mere trickery, then there must indeed have been a complete school of trickery, in which the greater part of the inhabitants must have conspired for the benefit of a single man, who is almost a stranger to them, and whom they do not as yet consider as one of themselves. Such an idea seems to me quite an absurdity. In short, in Heligoland, where everybody is known, and where nothing can be concealed, there is but one verdict upon the matter, and this excludes every idea of dishonesty.

Moreover, I may ask, whence could many of these birds, killed at Heligoland and still existing there, have been imported? I will quote only the

Motacilla certhiola, Pall.,

Motacilla salicaria, Pall. (or *Sylvia caligata*, Licht.),

Regulus modestus, Gould,

Motacilla citreola, Pall.,

Turdus varius, Pall.,

Pyrrhula rosea, Pall.,

Larus roseus, Jard. & Selby,

Larus sabinii, Leach.

As for others, such as *Emberiza pusilla*, Pall., Gaetke possessed

numerous specimens before they could be obtained through the trade. Finally, and in order to refute with a single word the last argument put forward to demonstrate this pretended swindle, I can inform his opponents that, so far from selling his rare birds, it was only in condescension to particular applications that Gaetke parted with a few scarce specimens, of which he possessed many, and this before they could be obtained from the dealers. All the more striking rarities are still to be seen only in his collection.

With regard to the bird-trade in Heligoland, there are but few inhabitants who are engaged in it. They kill and prepare the birds in autumn, winter, and spring, for the purpose of selling them in summer to the visitors of this watering-place. In their stock they often have things which would be considered as great rarities on the continent; but the prices are so low that no dealer in Germany, no ornithologist in the world, would part with them for such a trifle, if he were once possessed of them. I can the more confidently affirm this, as I had myself an opportunity of buying many rare birds, and am perfectly well acquainted with the prices of these articles asked by ornithological dealers. The highest prices in Heligoland are asked for the great Mews, *Larus marinus*, *L. fuscus*, and *L. argentatus*, but it is only for the reason that they are in great request amongst the visitors. Once more I say, the accusation of trickery or falsification is altogether out of the question: the trade in birds is an honest one, producing a casual and moderate profit to the inhabitants.

But I have said quite enough, or, rather, too much, about the suspicion so publicly raised; in answer to which I felt it my duty not to keep silence, but to explain how matters really stand. Not in order to save Gaetke's honour or the reputation of the Heligolandians. That is a private affair; and besides it would be superfluous to do this, as von Homeyer has not produced a single authenticated fact in support of the alleged trickery. Neither do I intend to blame von Homeyer's suspicions, which seem to me to have been incidentally raised by the discussion on moulting and colouring, in which he differed from Gaetke. All I desired was to remove the evil consequences of his assertions

on the cultivation of science. It is certainly no wonder that, when a man like von Homeyer casts his opinion on ornithological matters in the balance, there should be some weight attached to it, and it follows that others may be induced to give it their serious consideration. Every impartial man, it is true, must confess that there is not the slightest substantial reason for suspicion; but how many people there are who are ready to believe implicitly the assertions of a man of recognized authority! He, however, who is induced to do this must of necessity be ignorant of the facts cited by Gaetke, which may be confirmed by a visit to Heligoland. To save these facts, and to preserve them for the interest of European ornithology, was my duty, the more so as I had the opportunity of verifying and ascertaining them on the very spot. In my opinion, the contributions of Gaetke can not only not be doubted, but European ornithology is greatly indebted to him for his persevering researches for twenty years in this field.

I shall, of course, leave to Gaetke, who is now engaged in finishing his Fauna of Heligoland, the task of publishing his own observations himself. But I cannot refrain from pointing out a few of the results obtained by his long and zealous endeavours, and from adding a few remarks of my own. Amongst the rarities of the European fauna for a locality such as this, the following have been shot in Heligoland:—

1. *FALCO GYRFALCO* (L.), Schleg.—One of these specimens is the most interesting I ever saw. It is a young bird, in its transitory or moulting state, or passage to the old plumage. It shows that Schlegel was perfectly right in considering the old Norwegian Gyr Falcon as a bird marked and coloured as the old Wandering Falcon. Till now I never met a specimen in which the transition was so clearly to be observed.

2. *FALCO VESPERTINUS*, L.

3. *FALCO CENCHRIS*, Naumann.

4. *STRIX NYCTEA*, L.

5. *MEROPS APIASTER*, L.

6. *HIRUNDO RUFULA*, Temm.—On comparison of Sicilian

specimens with Siberian, the Swallow found in Heligoland evidently corresponds with the European form of this species (*H. rufula*), and not with *H. daürica*, L. (*H. alpestris*, Pall.).

7. *MUSCICAPA PARVA*, Bechst.

8. *LANIUS PHÆNICURUS*, Pall. New to Europe.

9. *CINCLUS PALLASII*, Temm.

10. *MERULA ROSEA*, Briss.

11. *TURDUS VARIUS*, Pall.

12. *TURDUS RUFICOLLIS*, Pall.

13. *ORPHEUS LIVIDUS* (Wils.). New to Europe.

14. *TOXOSTOMA RUFUM* (L.). New to Europe.

15. *PETROCICHLA SAXATILIS* (L.).

16. *ÆDON FAMILIARIS* (Ménétr.).—This bird is said to have been formerly frequently seen in Heligoland. I was told by Gaetke that the only individuals of this species killed in Heligoland known to him were in the collection of the apothecary Mecklenburg, at Flensburg. I went there in order to ascertain which of the two species, the Spanish-African, *Ædon galactodes* (Temm.), or the Greco-Asiatic, *Ædon familiaris* (Ménétr.), migrated into Heligoland. Undoubtedly it was the latter.

17. *CALAMOHERPE CERTHIOLA* (Pall.).—The bird is a splendid specimen in fresh plumage, and here found *for the first time* in Europe. Besides this one, von Middendorff killed two examples of this species near the Sea of Ochotsk. Up to that time, the only original specimen known was that of Pallas in the Museum of Berlin.

18. *IDUNA SALICARIA*, Pall. : *Sylvia caligata*, Licht.—Also for the first time observed in Western Europe.

19. *PHYLLOPNEUSTE PROREGULUS* (Pall.) : *Phyllobasileus superciliosus* (Lath.), Cabanis.

20. *PHYLLOPNEUSTE JAVANICA* (Horsfield), or a species very closely connected with it.—Observing this bird for the first time at Heligoland, I took it, from recollection, for one of the Javan

birds received from Paris, which Bonaparte himself, in his 'Consp. i. p. 240, declares to be his *Phyllopneuste javanica*, and which fully corresponds with a specimen of the *Phyllopneuste javanica*, or *Phyllopneuste magnirostris*, Blyth (no. 15969), lately received from Verreaux. Looking over my travelling notes, and, for the sake of science, comparing my stock, I was struck by a bird, also received from Verreaux, marked with the number 23707, without any denomination, the origin of which was described as follows:—"Sea of Ochotsk, latitude $59^{\circ} 38'$ N., longitude $147^{\circ} 30'$ E., Thursday, September 15, 1853. Eyes dark (*noir*) blue." Both the birds, from Java and from the Sea of Ochotsk, are so closely alike, that I was not able to ascertain from my fragmentary travelling memoranda to which of them the specimen of Heligoland might belong. But, after a closer comparison of the two birds, I can state that they do not belong to the same species, independently even of the circumstance that the places where they have been found are removed nearly 70 degrees of latitude one from the other. The name of the Javan species being already fixed, the question is to know if the Siberian species has been already described, or not. Bonaparte, in his 'Consp. i.' quotes the following Asiatic species:—*Sylvia brevirostris*, Strickl., *S. fuscata*, Blyth, and *S. griseola*, Blyth, from Middle Asia, and *Ficedula coronata*, Temm., from Japan; but none of these forms correspond with the one from the Sea of Ochotsk. Von Middendorff also, in his 'Voyage,' describes the *Sylvia (Phyllopneuste) sibirica*, v. Midd., as a new species, and the *Sylvia (Phyllopneuste) eversmanni*, Bonaparte. The first has nothing to do with the bird of the Sea of Ochotsk, whilst the latter perfectly corresponds with it. Von Middendorff obtained his *Sylvia eversmanni* on the Boganida, in latitude 70° north, and on the western declivity of the mountain Stanowoj, on the river Ujan. The place agrees pretty well with that of my bird from the Sea of Ochotsk.

But the bird of von Middendorff is certainly not that of Bonaparte. Bonaparte's *Phyllopneuste eversmanni* is simply the *Sylvia icterina* of Eversmann rebaptized (Eversm. Addend. ad Zoogr. Ross.). Bonaparte, in his Consp. p. 389, not only cites the bird of Eversmann under the head of this species, but he gives also, in his 'Revue Critique,' p. 30, his reason for doing

so, saying he does not like "*ce nom maudit d'icterina*." And truly he was right in the change of name, although it was hardly worth the trouble. Eversmann's *Sylvia icterina* was grounded on the *Ficedula icterina* of our 'Wirbelthiere Europas,' p. 185, no. 218. In a form differing a little in the structure of its wings from *Phyllopneuste trochilus*, I thought that I recognized the *Sylvia icterina* of Vieillot. Eversmann told me that in his classification he was guided by the short description in the 'Wirbelthiere Europas.' I possess an original specimen of Eversmann's *Sylvia icterina*, which fully agrees with examples of that species from Bavaria and Wirtemberg, and can only be ranged with the *Ph. trochilus*, or close to it. But, whatever may be our opinion as to this species, it has, at all events, nothing in common either with the bird from the Sea of Ochotsk under examination, or with the specimen of the bird described by v. Middendorff killed on the Boganida. I must therefore consider my bird from the Sea of Ochotsk, and the birds described by v. Middendorff as the *Sylvia (Phyllopneuste) eversmanni*, as belonging to quite a new species, which, in opposition to the Javan species standing next to it, I may call **PHYLLOPNEUSTE BOREALIS**, nov. sp.—It forms, together with the *Phyllopneuste javanica*, a natural group amongst the Leaf-warblers, distinguished from the other species by their considerably stronger body, by the bill being stronger and wider at its base, by the yellow band formed by the tips of the greater wing-coverts, by the ends of the quills being slender and distinctly emarginated at their terminations, by the bright yellow, sharply defined tips of the tail-feathers, and by the straight tail. This group may be designated by the name *Acanthopneuste*, and considered as a subdivision of the other Leaf-warblers.

The shining yellow spot on the wing, figured by v. Middendorff in his 'Travels,' vol. i. pl. 16. fig. 2, forms a half-perfect bright wing-band, and ranges both the species next to the *Phyllopneuste proregulus*, Pall. (= *Motacilla superciliosa*, Lath., = *Regulus modestus*, Gould), which has two yellow wing-bands and similar emarginated tips to the quills.

These two species may be distinguished in the following manner :—

Phyllopneuste javanica
(Horsf.).

The upper parts and the edges of the quills and tail-feathers brownish green.

The crown brownish green, of the same colour as the back.

The tail-feathers are broad, and gradually widened on the inner web up to the well-defined termination; the margin of the inner web turns towards the tip, making a rounded obtuse angle with the shaft.

The whitish termination of the first tail-feather attains its greatest breadth at the rounded obtuse angle formed by the inner web, at some distance from the shaft.

Phyllopneuste borealis,
nov. spec.

The upper parts and the edges of the quills and tail-feathers yellowish grass-green.

The crown gradually becoming dark-coloured grey-green.

The tail-feathers are slender, little widened, and attain their greatest breadth in the end-fourth; the margin of the inner web in the end-fourth forms an irregular arc with the shaft.

The whitish termination of the first tail-feather attains its greatest breadth close to the tip of the shaft on the inner web.

The lower parts of both the species are white along the middle, with a weak sulphur-coloured tint. The feathers of the sides of the head and of the front of the neck, in the Siberian species, are tinged with grey towards the ends and borders, so that these parts appear of a dull, cloudy grey; whilst the gorge and the front of the neck of the *Phyllopneuste javanica* is of a clear yellowish white. The flanks of the Siberian species are strongly tinged with a greenish-grey colour, their upper portions being almost of the colour of the back. The structure of the wings corresponds, in many respects, in both species. The first spurious quill is only a little larger than the upper coverts, and overreaches them in the Siberian species by about one line. The third and fourth quills are longest. The fifth is longer, the sixth shorter, than the second; but in the Siberian species the end of the second is nearer to that of the fifth than the sixth, whereas in the Javan species the end of the second is nearer to that of the sixth than the fifth. But perhaps these differences are of no great importance. In both species the third and the fourth quills are sensibly narrowed on the outer web. The wing of the Siberian species is considerably longer and also somewhat more pointed. The tail is in both species rather straight; the first

feather is very little shortened, the others in the Javan species of equal length; in the Siberian species the two middle feathers are slightly lengthened. The bill is in both species of a dark-blue horn-colour, with yellowish flesh-coloured borders. The feet are in both species bright-coloured—in the Javan brownish grey, and in the Siberian bluish green.

The measurements are as follows:—

	<i>Phyllopneuste javanica</i> , Horsf. Java.	<i>Phyllopneuste borealis</i> , nov. sp. Ochotsk Sea.	<i>Phyllopneuste icterina</i> , E. Eversm. exp.
Length of the wing	2'' 3·2'''	2'' 5·4'''	2'' 6'''
Length of the tail	1 7·8	1 8·8	1 11·5
Head and bill	1 1·3	1 2·2	1 0·5
Opening of the mouth	·7	7·3	6·5
Bill from the nostrils	3·4	3·6	2·6
Bill's thickness at the front	1·7	1·6	1·2
Breadth of bill	·2	·2	1·5
Tarsus	·9	·9	8·8
Middle claw and toe.....	5''' + 2·4'''	5''' + 2'''	4·5''' + 2'''
The first quill shorter by	1'' 3·4'''	1'' 5'''	1'' 2·3'''
The first quill longer than the } upper coverts by	3'''	1'''	4'''

The measurements given by v. Middendorff perfectly agree with those of the bird from the Sea of Ochotsk, but they differ, particularly in their proportions, from those of the original specimen of the *Phyllopneuste icterina*, Ev. = *eversmanni*, Bp.

I must leave it undecided as to which of these species the bird shot at Heligoland belongs; but I hope that Gaetke, to whom I have applied, will favour me either with positive information upon the matter, or with the bird itself, to make a comparison. On geographical grounds, it may be considered as more probable that the Siberian species immigrates into our latitudes; but nothing can be positively stated on the subject *à priori*.

21. SYLVIA ORPHEUS, Temm.

22. SAXICOLA RUFESCENS (Brisson): *S. aurita*, Temm.

23. SAXICOLA STAPAZINA, L.

24. MOTACILLA YARRELLII, Gould.

25. BUDYTES CITREOLA, Pall.—The young birds killed at Heligoland are especially interesting from their colour.

26. ANTHUS CERVINUS, Pall.

27. ANTHUS LUDOVICIANUS (Gm.).—This is certainly for the first time that this species has been observed in Europe.

28. ANTHUS RICHARDI, Vieill.

29. ALAUDA BRACHYDACTYLA, Leisl.

30. EMBERIZA PUSILLA, Pall.—By far more frequently observed there than the following species.

31. EMBERIZA RUSTICA, Pall.

32. EMBERIZA CÆSIA, Cretschm.

33. EMBERIZA HORTULANA, L.

34. EMBERIZA AUREOLA, Pall.

35. EMBERIZA MELANOCEPHALA, Scop.

36. PYRRHULA ROSEA, Pall.

37. PYRRHULA SERINUS, L.

38. FRINGILLA CITRINELLA, L.

39. PARUS BARBATUS, L.

40. ACCENTOR ALPINUS, L.

41. GRUS VIRGO, L.

42. EUDROMIAS ASIATICUS (Pall.).—This is a young bird, which undoubtedly belongs to this species, and not to *Charadrius pyrrhothorax*, Temm.

43. CHARADRIUS LONGIPES, Temm.: *Ch. orientalis*, Schleg.

44. CHARADRIUS VIRGINIANUS, Borekh.: *Ch. marmoratus*, Wagl.

45. ACTITIS RUFESCENS, Vieill.

46. TRINGA TEMMINCKII, Leisl.

47. LIMICOLA PYGMÆA, Lath.

48. STERNA DOUGALLI, Mont.

49. LARUS ROSEUS, Jard. and Selb. Winter plumage.

50. LARUS SABINII, Leach. Young plumage.

51. *ANAS PERSPICILLATA*, L.

52. *ANAS STELLERI*, Pall.

53. *THALASSIDROMA LEACHII*, Temm.

&c. &c.

Thus we see that birds from very different regions, including the north and south of Europe, the whole north of Asia and North America, choose this lonely rocky island as a place of rest during their migrations. Whatever may be the value of the occurrence of these isolated foreigners as regards the European fauna, the fact that they are met with here is, at all events, undeniable.

XI.—*Recent Ornithological Publications.*

1. ENGLISH PUBLICATIONS.

THE completion of Mr. Gould's 'Monograph of the Trochilidæ*' is an event in the history of ornithology which a journal devoted to that science cannot pass over in silence. In the first place, we must sincerely congratulate the author on his accomplishment of so great an undertaking. Any general connected account, even a mere synopsis, of a group of natural objects embracing over 400 species is, in these days, a task of no small labour; but when the subject selected is one of such difficulty and so little previously understood as that of the Humming-birds, the amount of hard work involved in it is something of which few people, unless personally acquainted with the facts of the case, can form any idea. It is true that we must still consider the 'Birds of Australia' to be, on the whole, the most remarkable of the magnificent series of works for which the name of JOHN GOULD must ever remain famous in the annals of our science. The special journey to the Antipodes, undertaken for the collection of materials, the number and importance of the new forms and new *facts* thus brought to light, and the complete novelty of the whole subject rendered the 'Birds of Australia' one of the most extraordinary works ever produced by the unassisted efforts of a private individual. But as an account of a single

* A Monograph of the Trochilidæ or Humming-birds. By John Gould, F.R.S., &c. London, 1861. 5 vols. imp. folio.